

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-17 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated June 17, 2005, Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Following this response, Claims 1-17 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Final Office Action dated June 17, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claim 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,999,948 ("*Nelson*"). Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein a runtime extension is selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request." Amended Claims 8 and 14 each include a similar recitation.

In contrast, *Nelson* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. Consistent with an embodiment of the invention, a request may be received by a Web server application 26 for a JSP page 42. (See specification page11, lines 22-23.) A file extension of the form JSP page 42 may indicate to

the Web server application 26 that a response to the request for the file should be handled by a JAVA runtime extension 28. (See specification page 11, lines 23-26.) An executable file class may be created from the form JSP page 42 by a JSP engine 34. (See specification page 11, lines 32-33.)

Instead, *Nelson* merely discloses creating and saving FDL files 13. (See col. 5, lines 1-2.) The created files are then registered with a form engine 19. (See col. 5, lines 2-3.) Upon registration, the FDL files 13 are parsed and data objects resulting from the parsing are added to a catalogue. (See col. 5, lines 6-9.) When a request to display a form is made, a dynamic forms engine constructs the form using information in the catalogue. (See col. 5, lines 53-56.) In *Nelson*, an executable class file capable of generating markup language for displaying fields is not created in response to determining that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized. And specifically, a runtime extension is not selected in *Nelson* to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request. Rather in *Nelson*, a FDL file 13 (what the Examiner analogizes to the claimed class file) is created and cataloged well before a request to display a page is made. Furthermore, no runtime extension is selected in *Nelson* to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request. In other words, in *Nelson*, the FDL file 13 is not created in response to determining that a previously compiled class file should be used nor is a runtime extension selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request.

In sum, *Nelson* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Nelson* at least does not disclose “wherein a runtime extension is selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request”, as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 8 and 14 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 8, and 14 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 14.

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-17 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 8, and 14, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 8, and 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-17.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the


related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 13, 2005

By: _____


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdb

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066

